

INFORMATION BULLETIN

WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT

Number: WIAB05-101

Date: June 27, 2006

Expiration Date: 06/30/07

69:128:jp:10084

TO: WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY

SUBJECT: LWIA ADVISORY COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES—
FRIDAY, MAY 19, 2006

The minutes and revised agenda from the Local Workforce Investment Area (LWIA) Advisory Committee conference call on Friday, May 19, 2006, are attached for your review and information. Please ensure that the minutes are provided to the appropriate staff.

If you have any questions regarding the minutes, please contact Jim Scholl, at (916) 657-4610.

/S/ BOB HERMSMEIER
Chief
Workforce Investment Division

Attachments

LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL

Friday, May 19, 2006

Agenda

10 a.m.	Welcome/Agenda Building/Hot Topics <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Self-Service Reporting• Local Plan Submission for PY 2006-07• WIA Allocations	Jose Luis Marquez, Workforce Investment Division (WID)
	California Workforce Investment Board (CWIB) Update <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Committee and Workgroup Activities• Annual Report	Ray York, CWIB
	National Expenditures Concerns	Dave Rexius, WID
	Performance Negotiation (New TEGL)	Liz Clingman, WID
	New Average Wage Measure	Liz Clingman, WID
	Request For Proposal Funding	Joe Werner, Monterey Workforce Investment Board (WIB)
	Additional Assistance Application Process	Robert Mejia, South Bay WIB
	Dislocated Worker Funds Status <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mass Layoff Statistics• Formula• Rapid Response Activities	Joe Werner, Monterey WIB
	EDD/CWIB Definition of One-Stop Center	Joe Daniel, Tulare WIB

LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES

Friday, May 19, 2006

Welcome/Agenda Building/Hot Topics—Jose Luis Marquez, Workforce Investment Division (WID). Jose Luis Marquez conducted the meeting for Bob Hermsmeier who could not participate.

- **Self-Service Reporting**—As of July 1, 2006, the State is required to report self-service counts on a quarterly basis. Draft Directive [WIADD-120](#), entitled *New Participant Reporting Requirements—Universal Services*, dated May 31, 2006, asks the Local Workforce Investment Areas (LWIA) to report their self-service counts for the period of July 1, 2005, to June 30, 2006, to WID no later than July 10, 2006. This will allow the self-service counts to be included in the year-end reporting. The directive asks the local areas to provide WID with that data each quarter thereafter, no later than the 20th of the month following the close of the quarter, e.g., for the quarter ending September 30 the data is due on October 20. The directive also defines self-service and goes through a sequence of definitions to help the local areas.

The directive provides instructions allowing the data to be submitted in one of two ways. (1) The LWIAs can put a universal access record in the Job Training Automation (JTA) system. Then, WID will match it against the regular registered clients in order to remove those clients that subsequently became registered in the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). The WID will also match those clients to the wage record file so the LWIAs can collect data on their self-service clients. (2) Using the form provided in the directive, the locals could fax WID an aggregate total of all self-service clients served. This option is subject to audit and will require keeping background information at the local level as to how the count was determined.

- **Local Plan Submission for Program Year (PY) 2006-07**—This agenda item was addressed by the release of Draft Directive WIADD-118, *Local Plan Modifications PY 2006-07*, dated May 5, 2006. Because of the delay in the release of the allocations, the State will revise the submission date to reflect this delay. Note: This draft directive became final on June 16, 2006. Please see Directive [WIAD05-19](#).
- **WIA Allocations**—Mike Curran, of NOVA, asked for an update on the status of the Youth allocations.

Jose Luis Marquez responded that there have been many challenges associated with calculating the allocations. Right now, the State has received planning estimates for both Adult and Youth. The State allocation is about 90 percent of what was received last year. There have been a number of data challenges, some

presented by the Department of Labor (DOL) and identified here in the Workforce Services Branch. This has added to the complexity. The WID is trying to get those finalized and will get the WIA allocations out as soon as possible.

Mike Curran requested that the local areas be kept informed of the process.

Note: Subsequent to this meeting, Information Bulletin, [WIAB05-95](#), entitled *PY 2006-07 Allotments and PY 2005-06 Rescission and Reallotment*, dated May 23, 2006, provided the preliminary allocations and background information on how they were developed.

Tim Taormina of the Labor Market Information Division (LMID) stated that the Areas of Substantial Unemployment (ASU) calculation will be completed and sent to the DOL by the May 26 deadline. The DOL will then recalculate state allocations and get the final allocations out to the states by early July. The LMID cannot produce the LWIA final allocations for Adult and Youth until after DOL provides the State with this information.

Various Advisory members stated that it is really difficult not to have any kind of information to provide in the local budget hearings. It gets more and more difficult to answer questions when you're standing in front of the Board of Supervisors or local elected officials. State staff agreed to provide an update on the allocation process. The update was e-mailed later that day.

Dave Rexius of WID confirmed that subgrants, including the first Youth allocation, went out on May 12.

Dave Dahlberg of LMID, said the 2000 census wrongly counted people as permanent residents who lived in temporary housing, like students and migrant and seasonal farm workers. When the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) learned of the Census Bureau's error, they decided they could not use the 2000 census data in their computations, opting to use Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS) program data instead of the census data. However, after spending several months pursuing that solution, BLS determined that using LAUS data would introduce other problems for California and many other large states. In late April, DOL said the states had to go back and use the 1990 census data to calculate the ASU. The LMID will complete the task needed to re-compute and still stay within DOL's timeframe.

California Workforce Investment Board (CWIB) Update—Ray York, CWIB. The following is an update on the CWIB Committees, Workgroups, and the Annual Report.

- Business and Industry Committee, Teresa Gonzales. The Committee will be meeting on June 14 at the Sacramento Employment & Training Agency. The agenda will include three items.
 1. The Committee conducted a joint survey with the California Association for Local Economic Development to determine the extent of collaboration between the two systems. Although coordination exists, the Committee saw an opportunity for further collaboration. The regional forums are intended to bring together

executive staff from the Workforce and Economic Development systems. The forums are a joint collaboration with the California Workforce Association (CWA), the Employment Training Panel, and the California Community Colleges. The regional forums will be in Modesto on May 25, followed by Chico on May 31, and in Riverside Inland Empire on June 7. The remaining five regional forums will be conducted after July 1 and completed by the end of the calendar year.

2. The Business Services workgroup has been meeting to establish a consistent level of business services in the One-Stops. The workgroup has met three times and the final meeting is scheduled for May 22. The workgroup is developing a policy framework that includes the following components: (1) guiding principles, (2) business services definition, (3) business services criteria, (4) business services categories, (5) business services indicators, and (6) identifying potential resources for business services. The workgroup has representatives from community colleges, local workforce areas, and economic development participating in the building of these components.
 3. The Governor has established the high wage-high growth priority under the 15 percent funds. The committee is developing criteria to further define the priority.
- Target Resources Committee, John Bohart. The committee met in April and is making good progress with its activities. One activity is the minimum wage proposal which will now be incorporated in the 15 Percent Solicitation for Proposal (SFP) that is scheduled for release in August or September. The committee looked at a number of policy elements for that category in the SFP and came to consensus on recommendations that will be incorporated in the SFP.

The committee also had a good strategic planning session which included a process of prioritization. The three next steps include (1) to explore and develop policy recommendations to support partnerships between One-Stops, social services, and economic development staff, (2) to examine potential resources for statewide initiatives that increase resources available through the One-Stops and the Workforce Investment Boards by such means as financial support from industry foundations, the federal government, and other State agencies, and (3) to evaluate the Governor's 15 Percent Discretionary funds competitive local grants process that requires the coordination of proposals with local boards and their local strategic plans. Also, the committee will continue to move forward on a Goods Movement Logistics Industries proposal.

- LifeLong Learning Committee, David Militzer. The LifeLong Learning Committee met in April. The next meeting is planned for June 26 at Preservation Park in Oakland. The Committee has developed a brief LifeLong Learning element that is included in the draft planning guidance. The Committee is coordinating with the Targeting Resources Committee with the Goods Movement's Logistics proposal. Another area of discussion for the June 26 meeting will be strategic planning.

The Career Advancement Academics Concept is a workforce education collaborative model. The community colleges are actively pursuing funding in the new career tech

budget. This is currently penciled into the Governor's general funds budget. There will be \$8.75 million of general fund dollars that can be used to promote community college and workforce collaborations. That amount will be targeted to 18 to 30 year olds who are not well-connected to employment and training opportunities.

- Accountability in Workforce Investments Committee, Ray York. A meeting is scheduled for June 15 in Southern California. The meeting will provide updates including examining active agenda items the committee wants to prioritize.
 1. Cost Study. The research team is about to finalize the first pilot case study and will soon launch the second pilot. The committee is ready to finalize the selection of the third and fourth pilot case studies. From there, they will start developing methodologies for the next level of surveys. State members of the study team have been meeting individually with the State partners to obtain data relative to indirect and direct costs that support the One-Stop system. The data should be summarized by the end of June. The study team is still looking for volunteers relative to the second round of surveys. If interested, please contact Ray York or Steve Saxton.
 2. One-Stop Certification Process, John Bohart. The workgroup is reviewing the previously developed basic criteria for the State-level One-Stop Certification process. The committee will create a strategy using the criteria as the foundation for a technical assistance guide that would become a critical element of the One-Stop certification process. This would be a voluntary system to support local board efforts to certify their own One-Stop centers. The workgroup is looking at giving incentives to the locals who use these criteria. The workgroup's goal is to present solid recommendations to the July 20 full board meeting.

An Advisory member asked how this connected with the accountability issue raised by Emily DeRocco and her concern that the 17 performance measures did not collect the needed data. Ray York said at this time it is not connected, but is under the purview of the committee. In future meetings, the committee will examine various policy items to determine what items the committee should prioritize.

Liz Clingman stated that the issue is the quality of data of the collected 17 performance measures. The General Accounting Office has reiterated their interest in employment retention and wages through the publication of the common measures. The other areas that are insufficiently covered by the 17 measures are the whole concept of employer-related services and the issue of a demand-driven system and services to business.

- Annual Report, Javier Romero. Under the direction of CWIB's Executive Director and the Labor Workforce Development Agency, the new Annual Report will be developed to be used as a marketing tool. The targeted audience is primarily employers, the legislature, and policymaker entities. David Trovato of CWA sent an e-mail to the local areas that outlined the categories identified to gather stories that can be used for the Annual Report.

At this point, the committee engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding the Reauthorization of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program. For background information, please refer to Information Bulletin [WIAB05-78](#), entitled *LWIA Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes—February 17, 2006*, dated March 22, 2006.

For current TANF information provided by CWIB staff, you may go to the following link, www.clasp.org/publications/tanf_ed_training.pdf to review “*Strategies for Increasing Participation in TANF Education and Training Activities*,” by Evelyn Ganzglass of the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP). This paper is being used as the starting point in developing job training strategies to overcome barriers caused by the changes under the new TANF Reauthorization.

Attachment 3, also provided by CWIB staff, are minutes from the May 26 meeting of the Interagency TANF Workgroup 5 on education, training, and employment. This attachment also includes the agenda from the most current meeting of the workgroup on June 6, 2006.

National Expenditure Concerns—Dave Rexius, WID. Dave noted that DOL continues to review expenditure levels for each of the states even though WIA requirements are based upon using obligation rates as the benchmark rather than expenditures. It was also noted that each quarter DOL continues to ask California to address their expenditure levels.

It was noted that DOL has also raised a concern about the large amount of WIA funds being carried forward by all the states into Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06. In a recent reconciliation of carry-forward funds with DOL, Dave indicated California carried approximately \$132 million into FY 2005-06. Of the \$132 million, \$104 million was carried in by the LWIAs.

In conjunction with the reconciliation, a conference call was held with Jack Rapport of DOL. As part of the call, WID and DOL discussed the matter of the few LWIAs that had carried a significant amount of funds into 2005-06. It was agreed the State would complete an analysis of the expenditure levels of those LWIAs and as such, the State was in the process of developing a survey sheet so LWIAs could provide information needed for the analysis. Dave noted that although the State’s expenditure levels always seem to meet DOL’s spending threshold by the end of the fiscal year, DOL still felt California needed to monitor each LWIA’s expenditure level on a quarterly basis.

The DOL is also concerned that accruals are not being reported correctly using generally accepted accounting principles. Dave asked the locals to review their system for accruals so that expenditures are properly reported.

Two Advisory members suggested the State also present a full status of the WIA discretionary accounts to all the Administrators. They requested that the State provide specific full data on these accounts so that real solutions could be created.

Jose Luis responded by saying WID would definitely follow up on the suggestion.

Performance Negotiation (New TEGL)—Liz Clingman, WID. On May 12, the Secretary of Labor issued Training and Employment Guidance Letter (TEGL) 29-05 requesting states submit their proposals to renegotiate the new Adult and Dislocated Worker Average Wage Measure by May 30. Also, the TEGL gave instructions for negotiation of the Adult Common Measures for the Wagner-Peyser program. This inclusion of the Wagner-Peyser programs in the Common Measures accountability system is an important milestone for the One-Stop partnership. Please forward any comments regarding State negotiations to Marc Wilson at mwilson3@edd.ca.gov.

This negotiation process presents an opportunity to renegotiate any of our other WIA 2006-07 State-level performance measures. However, based on the current data, California appears to be in good shape for 2006-07. The two places that are marginal are the credential rates and retention rates for adults and dislocated workers.

New Average Wage Measure—Liz Clingman, WID. As indicated in the prior agenda item, beginning in PY 2006, the WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker programs will be evaluated on a new post-program Average Wage Measure instead of the Wage Gain Measure. While this is a retroactive measure, and for PY 2006 applies to exiters from the program between April 1, 2005, and March 30, 2006, this measure should be easier to deal with than the old Wage Gain Measure. The new measure looks only at post-program wages, so local areas have none of the issues related to severance pay. The new wage measure looks at earnings at the 2nd and 3rd quarter after exit, divided by the number of exiters in the measurement time period.

Request For Proposal Funding—Joe Werner, Monterey WIB. The local areas have been a little perplexed on the goals, objectives, and the design the State uses to determine funding of the discretionary special projects. The local areas appreciate the State for its recent efforts to be more inclusive in the discussion of how these funds should be used. It is the LWIA's hope that the State would consider the local workforce system as a conduit for discretionary money. With the impending formula funds reductions, it is imperative that the locals have a clear understanding of what is available to "patch up" the statewide comprehensive workforce development system. The question is where is the forum to discuss the goals and objectives of the workforce system and how to utilize those discretionary funds to meet the challenges at the local level.

Jose Luis Marquez indicated that WID understands these concerns. The State should try to periodically disclose the balance in the discretionary accounts. The level of detail may be an issue but we will report back.

Joe Werner said he would like to know where all the money is, how it is being spent, what are the results of the programs that have been funded, and more importantly, if the State will pull funds back from grantees not efficiently using these funds.

Jose Luis stated that Directive [WIAD04-11](#) entitled *Unilateral De-Obligation*, dated November 18, 2004, provides information on how the State manages projects that are lagging. The State is recapturing funding from projects that have lagged behind. He thanked the Advisory for their input in that the State should continue to aggressively manage these 15 Percent Discretionary projects.

Additional Assistance Application Process—Robert Mejia, South Bay WIB. Why does Directive [WIAD05-8](#), entitled *Dislocated Worker Additional Assistance Projects*, dated October 12, 2005, require an application for any increases to the amount of an approved project? South Bay is considering submitting a new application. However, why is it necessary to submit a new application for an existing project with the same type of employers and the same type of layoffs?

Jose Luis replied that the only way the Workforce Services Branch can secure the necessary authority to award WIA funding, is to put forward a new application. Funding decisions are based on the detail provided in the applications. Among other things, project goals, expected outcomes, and the cost per entered employment are analyzed to determine if a project should be funded.

Robert Mejia stated that locals always hear that the application process is going to be streamlined. However, local areas continue to have to wait several weeks, if not months, after an application is submitted to get approval.

Jose Luis stated that we are aware of these concerns. Jose Luis asked Ray York if this is something the Dislocated Worker Workgroup might want to consider in terms of their work. Ray York said this could be an active agenda item for the workgroup to consider.

Dislocated Worker (DW) Funds Status—Joseph Werner, Monterey WIB. An advisory member asked about the status of the Dislocated Worker Workgroup's Dislocated Worker formula paper.

The State representatives on the workgroup are drafting a concept paper to identify the issues, concerns, and alternatives related to this issue. Once that is done, it will be brought back to the workgroup to ensure all the issues are adequately addressed. At this point, the local areas would be given an opportunity to provide input possibly through the draft directive process. It would then go forward for consideration by the CWIB and the Labor Agency.

EDD/CWIB Definition of One-Stop Center—Joe Daniel, Tulare WIB. This agenda item will be deferred to the next meeting.

**STAKEHOLDER WORKGROUP 5: EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND EMPLOYMENT
May 26, 2006, MEETING NOTES**

Workgroup Members

Present	Absent	Name/Organization	Present	Absent	Name/Organization
x		Barbara Baran, California Budget Project		x	Cathy Senderling, CWDA
	x	Kevin Aslanian, CCWRO		x	Frank Mecca, CWDA
x		Bill Burke, EDD	x		Kären Cagle, CDSS
	x	Jaime Fall, Labor & Workforce Development agency	x		Chris Webb-Curtis, CDSS
x		Christian Griffith, Assembly Budget Committee	x		Kathy Lewis, CDSS
x		Anastasia Dodson, Senate Budget & Fiscal Review	x		Teri Ellen, CDSS
x		Kate Meiss, Neighborhood Legal Services of LA Co.	x		Audrey King, CDSS
	x	Brian McMahon, CA Workforce Investment Board	x		Voltair Ignacio, CDSS
x		Donald Merrill, Dept. of Industrial Relations		x	Andrea Willits, CDSS
	x	Charr Lee Metsker, CDSS	x		Kristin Sanchez, CDSS
x		Sonia Ortiz-Mercado, CA Community Colleges	x		Gail Sullivan, CDSS
x		Michael Rice, Employment Training Panel		x	Al Tweltridge, CDE
x		Patricia Servin-Lemus, CA Community Colleges		x	Ray York, CWIB
x		Sara McCarthy, Senate Office of Research	x		Geoff Miller, CDSS
x		Jerry Dunn, Sonoma County, WIB	x		Salena Chow, CDSS
	x	Wendy Therrian, Contra Costa County	x		Bill DeVore, CDSS
x		Mike Herald, Western Center on Law & Poverty	x		Pat I. Davis, CSU
x		Jodie Berger, Legal Services Northern CA	x		Javier Romero, CWIB
x		Kathy Dutton, Chaffey College	x		Dena Taylor, Cabrillo College
x		Graham Knaus, CWDA	x		Julie Wible, CDE

Workgroup Ground Rules

In order to facilitate discussion, especially with teleconferencing, the group adopted the following ground rules:

1. The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) will moderate the discussion
2. Everyone will ask the meeting facilitator to speak
3. Everyone will hold remarks to a minute
4. Everyone will pause before speaking to make sure they're in the queue

Discussion of Federal/State Work Participation and Activities Requirements

The CDSS gave an overview of the federal and State work participation requirements using a comparison chart (see handout). The chart may change when the new federal regulations define the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) acceptable work activities are released on June 30, 2006.

Issues:

- Designing 12-month programs for vocational education.
- How are counties recording vocational education participation?
- Where does vocational ESL fit?

Discussion of Communication Issues

The group agreed that there definitely is a communication problem between the county welfare departments (CWD) and the service providers (education, training, and employment).

Community Colleges

- It is a big statewide issue for community colleges to not have access to a student's Welfare-to-Work (WtW) plan (based on feedback from statewide advisory group of community colleges). Is this a policy issue?
- There needs to be clear definition of a CalWORKs student's participation requirements.
- Community colleges are not given copies of a CalWORKs student's WtW plans or assessments, which causes duplication of efforts and the student being placed in classes not addressing their needs.
- Community colleges need coordination and information sharing.
- Challenges or pressures on sharing information include maintaining confidentiality, automation, and resources.
- They have a conference June 13-14 that will allow them to share best practices and train their staff. Western Center presents WtW requirements.

Very few counties perform data matches with community colleges. Between 40,000 to 50,000 CalWORKs participants are in the community college system whose class activities are not known. Community colleges can access the data in their state data system and can do a data match with CDSS. Per the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges (COCCC), the data match would show if assistance unit is in sanction (no adult).

Look at Santa Rosa Community College and Sonoma County as potential models of good communication/partnership. The county's CalWIN system allows community college's counseling staff to pull-up a CalWORKs student's WtW plan or anything related to the case. College can enter attendance. The system allows access with a password and a confidentiality paper signed. Los Angeles is piloting with three

community colleges on sharing data. Community colleges can review client status, but not assessment/WtW plan (access is to GEARS). Also, positive when Los Angeles Co. WtW workers come to campus weekly. Some community colleges have contracts with CWDs to do case management.

The recent Senate Budget Committee allocation of \$25 million for collaborative purposes between CWD and the service providers (plus \$9.9 million for community colleges) may help address the communication issue. However, communication between the stakeholders must be flexible enough in order to meet the new federal work participation requirements. Improved communication should result in an increase in work participation rate. But we should not lose the focus that our collaborative efforts not only increase the work participation rate but also make the CalWORKs participant self-sufficient.

A suggestion was made that policy issues also may contribute to the low work participation rate. Should more people be allowed to enter in Self-Initiated Programs (SIPs) even if they cannot meet the work participation requirement via the SIP? How do we count those who aren't in approved SIPs but are taking classes at community colleges? Perhaps with work study they could meet participation requirements. Perhaps there is a need for statutory change. Many students are taking voluntary sanctions in order to finish school faster without having to worry about meeting their work requirements.

Question: How many sanctioned CalWORKs students are attending community colleges?

Additionally, definitions of work activities may not be consistent between the counties and providers. Community colleges labels internships/externships by CalWORKs students as community service; not sure how community service is defined by CWDs. Also, many CalWORKs students in the community college system may be in-between activities/semesters and may be falsely counted by the CWD as non-engaged. In reality, the person is engaged but has a long wait time between semesters, which hurts the State's work participation rate.

Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) is an "end-user" of CalWORKs clients:

- DIR sends written job opening notices to community colleges, CBOs, and EDD (but not to CWDs)
- Apprenticeships (with high wages [\$16/hour] go begging)
- Assumption that participants need higher level of education to get in
- Los Angeles tries to get people into Apprenticeships—barriers: limited English, no Drivers' License, lack of math skills
- Doesn't track where participants came from
- Issue with Employment Training Panel (ETP) pre-apprenticeship programs, but ETP is set up better for pre-apprenticeship programs.

Workforce Investment Boards

- Need qualified recipients
- CWDs need clear understanding of employer needs
- Funding hasn't kept up—limited resources inhibit communication

CSUS:

- No infrastructure—because of scope and size, they need it
- Work with SIPs
- Overwhelmed
- Automation is appealing
- University employees don't know CalWORKs requirements, don't have access to plans
- LA making it easier
- Too late to open up the budget, but \$25 million is available and provides incentive for the California State University, Sacramento (CSUS) to work with COCCC and CWDs

Identified Problems:

- Confidentiality waivers - some community college staff are not informed that sharing of CalWORKs clients' information can occur. Some WtW staff doesn't know that sharing can occur (or even should occur).
- There is a need to build relationships at the regional level. For example, Los Angeles County has a good collaborative relationship with the local workforce investment board (WIB) providers, but not with the local one-stop centers.
- Without communication, will be hard to meet federal requirements (need to count all hours)
- CalWORKs participants may be participating, but CWDs don't know (and can't count)
- Some providers have no way to track which participants got referred by the CWD or are CalWORKs participants.
- The One-Stop system does not always fit the CalWORKs model. The CWDs just cannot refer the CalWORKs participant to a One-Stop; CWDs need to understand the One-Stop system first. There is a need to understand each others' systems and needs.
- CWDs may not see the value in pre-apprenticeship programs and may not direct the CalWORKs client towards traditional jobs (e.g., garbage collector).
- Automation issues related to converting old WtW plan to new systems are not always perfect.
- CWDs and WIBs have budget problems associated with increased caseloads.
- County and State agencies are not using apprenticeship to meet its staffing needs.

- Addressing the needs of participants with limited English.
- Delays in development of WtW plan that results in increasing numbers of CalWORKs recipients going to COCCC, enrolling in classes, but not consistent with plan (puts COCCC in middle)
- How to deal with people in-between activities.

RECOMMENDATION:

Identify how many clients are getting their WtW plan within the required time period. Have counties look at their data to determine the impact of SB1104 on this issue.

Discussion of Legislative Budget Action

- CWDs need to be key players; should form collaborative relationships with employment, education, and training providers. It is anticipated that DSS will review proposals (streamlined review process with outcome measures, and tied to data). Look into the child welfare system as a model.
- What is the COCCC doing in terms of short-term training programs for CalWORKs students?
- ETP has a better pre-apprenticeship program than the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR). DIR representative will do a write-up of pre-apprenticeship prohibition issues between ETP and DIR.
- Problem with linkages between remedial learning and English language learners.
- Question was raised about why no requirement for ETP to spend the funding returned to it on CalWORKs participants.
- The \$25 million set-aside was positively received; one stakeholder suggested that the measure specify that English language learners be specifically included as a target population. Note: Los Angeles Valley College has short-term English language learner training.
- One stakeholder cautioned against adding too many different requirements in the funding proposals—but to stay focused on the results. Another urged continued preservation of local flexibility.

Discussion for Next Meeting:

- Invite more county representatives and continue the discussion on communication issues and information sharing between counties and employment, training, and education providers.

Next Meeting:

Tuesday, June 6, 2006, 10 a.m. to Noon
EDD building, 722 Capitol Mall, Room 4061

Action	Responsible Person	Due Date/Status
<i>Requests</i>		
Data on 2-parent work participation rate.	CDSS	ASAP -Email to the group
Write-up pre-apprenticeship prohibitions between Employment Training Panel (ETP) and Department of Industrial Relations and why ETP has a better pre-apprenticeship program set-up than DIR. (Anastasia's request.)	Donald Merrill, DIR	ASAP

**TANF REAUTHORIZATION WORKGROUP 5
MEETING AGENDA
Tuesday, June 6, 2006, 10 a.m.—Noon
Employment Development Department
722 Capitol Mall, Room 4061**

Introductions and Sign-Ins

Approval of May 26 Notes (any changes from the group?)

Agenda Review/Adjustment: Are these the right priorities for discussion?

Sharing Welfare to Work Plans/Assessments with Providers

- Barriers identified are confidentiality, staffing, and automation.
- Are there other barriers?
- What specific confidentiality and automation barriers need to be addressed?
- What are next steps?

Use of Apprenticeships/Relationship between DIR, ETP, Counties (How can more CalWORKs participants be enrolled in Apprenticeships/pre-Apprenticeships?)

- Barriers identified are communication, policy barrier(s) between DIR, ETP, education levels of CalWORKs participants, lack of CA drivers' licenses
- What are the specific policy barriers? (DIR, ETP)
- Are there other barriers?
- How should these barriers be addressed?

What is the best way for CalWORKs to use One-Stops? (from One-Stop perspective, from CWD perspective)

- Any models?
- Any specific cautions?
- What specific uses work best?

What is the best way for CalWORKs to access Workforce Investment Act programs? (WIB perspective)

- Short of contracts, when are CalWORKs recipients best able to access WIA?
- If contracts are used, what WIA services seem to work best?

Determine What to Share with Stakeholders Meeting, June 9

Determine Next Agenda Topics, Next Steps, and Action Items

Schedule Next Meeting Dates/Times